

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**COOS BAY RV INVESTMENTS, LLC, a
Delaware Limited Liability Company,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**WEELHAUS, INC., a Wyoming
Corporation, and JAMIE MACKAY, an
individual,**

Defendants.

Case No. 3:21-cv-448-AC

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge John V. Acosta issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on October 14, 2021. Judge Acosta recommended that this Court grant Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment and enter judgment awarding compensatory damages, pre-judgment interest, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs in favor of Plaintiff. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (Act), the court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files an objection to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States. v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review *de novo* magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Acosta’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS Judge Acosta’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF 24. The Court GRANTS Plaintiff’s Motion for Default Judgment, ECF 16. The Court will enter a judgment against Defendant, awarding Plaintiff damages in the amount of \$1,538,444.58 for out-of-pocket expenses and lost profits, plus pre-judgment interest, post-judgment interest, and reasonable attorney’s fees and costs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 4th day of November, 2021.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
 Michael H. Simon
 United States District Judge